



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,750	11/30/2000	Tarri E. Furlong	SIEB026/01US	1600
25096	7590	08/10/2006	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP			BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
PATENT-SEA				
P.O. BOX 1247			ART UNIT	
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			PAPER NUMBER	
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/725,750

**Applicant(s)**

FURLONG ET AL.

**Examiner**

Adam L. Basehoar

**Art Unit**

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11, 13, 14, and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: The RCE filed 07/24/06.
2. Claims 9-11, 13-14, 16-20, and 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft PowerPoint 2000, 03/10/99, "Selling an Idea for a Product," pp. 1-9 (Hereafter known as "MPP2000") in view of Health et al (US-6,938,032 08/30/05) ) in further view of Markus et al (US-6,490,601 12/03/02).
3. Claims 9-11, 13-14, 16-20, and 22 are pending in the case. Claims 9, 14, and 17 are independent claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 9-11, 13-14, 16-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft PowerPoint 2000, 03/10/99, "Selling an Idea for a Product," pp. 1-9 (Hereafter known as "MPP2000") in view of Health et al (US-6,938,032 08/30/05) in further view of Markus et al (US-6,490,601 12/03/02).

-In regard to independent claims 1, 14, and 17, MPP2000 teaches a computer implemented method, system, and data structure for generating slide presentations for a presentation target, comprising:

creating at least one presentation definition template (Page 9: “Selling a Product or Service” Template) having a plurality of component definitions (Pages 1-8: Slides), at least one component definition having an information bookmark (Pages 1-8: Bullet (text) and Graphic (pictures): e.g. Page 4 “List the products and features...a specific problem” and Triangle Graphics).

MPP2000 does not specifically teach a means for associating a query condition with each component definition, a means for determining whether to include each of a plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on the query condition and a command to generate a slide presentation for a presentation target, and a means for including each component definition that satisfies the associated query condition. Heath et al teach a means for associating a query condition (column 2, lines 5-16; column 4, lines 3-9: i.e. each stored slide in the database maintains information about said slide that may be queried, such as the text of the slide or the topic of the slide) with each component definition (column 2, lines 1-2: i.e. slides), a means for determining without user interaction (i.e. user selects the query and then the computer, via the search string, “determines” the appropriate slides) whether to include each of a plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on the query condition (column 4, lines 3-9 & 17-20: i.e. do the slides in the database satisfy the search criteria) in response to a command to generate a slide presentation for a presentation target (column 4, lines 17-29), and a means for including each component definition that satisfies the associated query condition (column 4, lines 17-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for MPP2000 to have included associated a query condition with each component definition and only selected said component definitions that satisfied the query to be included in the presentation as taught in

Art Unit: 2178

Heath et al, because Heath et al teach that doing so provides the benefit of allowing customized searches to be performed that return identifying information for individual slides from multiple preexisting presentations (column 1, lines 20-35: i.e. Heath et al teach a method to quickly build customized presentations from a database of preexisting slides via querying the database which in turn return only the slides of relevance).

MPP2000 teaches wherein a user would then manually enter opportunity-specific data (Page 5: cost analysis benefits: Page 4: problem solving features) into the information bookmarks to create the slide presentation. MPP2000 and Heath et al also teach determining whether to include each of a plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on the query condition (column 4, lines 3-9 & 17-20: i.e. do the slides in the database satisfy the search criteria). However, neither teach wherein the determining also includes utilizing the opportunity-specific data. Markus et al teach determining data to be incorporated into a form document based on opportunity-specific data (column 5, lines 1-12: i.e. selects the raw data file based on the associated user). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention for MPP2000 and Heath, to have selected the component definitions based on the opportunity specific data, because Heath teaches a method to quickly build customized presentations via selecting the slides only of relevance, and thus by selecting the slides based on the opportunity-specific data associated with the presentation target, more relevant and thus more useful slides would be incorporated into the slide presentation (i.e. with more data to be compared, only the most appropriate slides would be selected for the target audience)

MPP2000 teaches wherein a user would then manually enter opportunity-specific data (Page 5: cost analysis benefits; Page 4: problem solving features) into the information bookmarks to create the slide presentation. MPP2000 also does not teach mapping the information bookmark and the opportunity-specific data and automatically replacing the bookmark with the mapped data when creating the slide presentation. Markus et al teach mapping between information bookmarks (i.e. “fields”) and data strings in a raw data file associated with a user (column 5, lines 1-12). Markus et al also teach automatically (i.e. without user interaction) filling in the fields with the user data when creating the presentation (column 5, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for MPP2000 to have automatically replaced the information bookmarks with mapped opportunity-specific user data, because Markus et al taught that doing so would quickly and automatically fill out electronic presentations, relieving the user of the burden of manually inputting the data (column 4, lines 42-46).

-In regard to dependent claims 10, 16, 18, and 20, MPP2000 teaches wherein the presentation target was a potential customer (Page 3: “Customer Requirements”) of a sales organization (Page 1: “Selling an Idea or a Product”), and wherein the opportunity-specific data relates to potential sales opportunities (Page 7: “product, service, or idea”) between the sales organization and the potential customer (e.g. Page 5: “financial benefits” and Page 4: “solves a specific problem”).

-In regard to claims 11 and 19, MPP2000 teaches associating a theme (Page 1: "Selling a Idea or Product") with the template, the theme indicating a primary decision criterion of the presentation target (i.e. Should the presentation target purchase the idea or product).

-In regard to dependent claims 13 and 22, MPP2000 does not teach wherein the query condition was a predefined threshold. Heath et al also teach wherein the query condition was a predefined threshold (column 4, lines 4-5 & 17-19: i.e. slides where predefined to a given topic heading as well as the individual text they contained. The threshold being does the component definition meet topic selection or does the component definition meet the text query selection). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for MPP2000 to have selected the component definitions based on a query threshold, because Heath et al teach that doing so provides the benefit of allowing customized searches to be performed that return identifying information for individual slides that meet the specific limitations of the query (i.e. of the target audience)(column 1, lines 20-35; column 4, lines 3-5 & 17-19)(Fig. 3).

In addition, Markus et al teach a wherein a query condition (column 15, line 1: "use threshold") was a predefined user threshold (column 15, lines 1-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for MPP2000 to have selected the component definitions based on a query threshold, because Markus et al teach wherein a query threshold provided the benefit of user privacy in allowing user information to be included in a presentation only when the user would have wanted it to (column 15, lines 1-50).

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 07/24/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to the independent claims, the Applicant argues that the combined references fail to teach or suggest the amended limitations wherein the determining step uses opportunity-specific data as well as the determining and replacing are performed without human interaction. Please note the above rejection to the claims in view of these added features.

In general the Examiner notes that within the computer processing art, the limitation of “without human interaction” (i.e. automatically) is a vaguely defined feature that is broadly limited. The two reasons for this in view of present application and references are 1) the actual determining of the slide presentation is done by the computer processor which determines the slides that satisfy the query condition. Thus even though a user may select the query term, the actual “determining” is done by the computer 2) Conversely, any supposed automatic step preceded by a user interaction is itself performed with user interaction. Thus in the independent claims the selection of the presentation target could be considered to nullify the without interaction limitations for the determining and replacing steps.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments that there is no suggestion to combine MPP2000 with the teachings of Markus. MPP2000 clearly teaches, as described above, creating at least one presentation definition template (Page 9: “Selling a Product or Service” Template) having a plurality of component definitions (Pages 1-8: Slides), at least one component definition having an information bookmark (Pages 1-8: Bullet (text) and Graphic (pictures): e.g. Page 4 “List the products and features...a specific problem” and Triangle



Art Unit: 2178

Graphics). In more general terms MPP2000 teaches a PowerPoint presentation (i.e. a document) targeted for a specific audience that included a plurality of presentation slides. Each of said slides in turn included information areas wherein the creator of the presentation could manually enter target specific data into the predefined information areas. The Markus reference on the other hand teaches an automatic method for filling out forms (i.e. documents) with user specific data. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for MPP2000 to have automatically replaced the information areas with mapped opportunity-specific user data, because Markus et al taught that doing so would quickly and automatically fill out electronic presentations, relieving the user of the burden of manually inputting the data (column 4, lines 42-67; column 5, 1-12). Thus unlike the Applicant's assertions, the Markus clearly teaches a motivation in the reference for automatically filling out fields in a document. For arguments sake, the Examiner notes that the benefits and methods for automatically filling out data into a document/form/web page were all notoriously well known features in the art at the time of the invention.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US-2006/0085449	04-2006	Sattler et al.
US-2005/0216431	09-2005	Baker et al.
US-2004/0210845	10-2004	Paul et al.

Art Unit: 2178

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**